

Implementation of Integrated Crisis Plans to Improve Outcomes



BACKGROUND



- In October 2015, the Juvenile Justice Team began a Niatx project to look at our processes around crisis planning for our youth.
- A walkthrough identified various technical issues with the actual plans as well as who received them at that time and why.
- Realizing that every juvenile/family who comes to us has experienced some sort of crisis, we decided to develop a process to ensure that 100% of our youth will receive crisis planning services.

NEW PROCESS



**EVERY YOUTH RECEIVES AN ASSESSMENT
AND CASE PLAN THROUGH THE TCM
PROGRAM. CRISIS PLANNING WILL BE DONE
WITH EVERY FAMILY AS PART OF THE
ASSESSMENT AND CASE PLANNING PROCESS.**

**AS A RESULT, 100% OF OUR YOUTH AND
FAMILIES NOW CREATE MEANINGFUL CRISIS
PLANS WITH THE ASSISTANCE OF THEIR JJ
WORKERS.**

Meanwhile...

Kathi Cauley's gears were turning as she tried to solve a puzzling question.

“How do we improve our responses for kids who are experiencing a mental health crisis?”



Youth Crisis Stabilization Committee



**SOME OF JEFFERSON COUNTY'S MOST
BRILLIANT MINDS (J/K) FORMED A
COMMITTEE TO FIND SOLUTIONS TO THIS
DIFFICULT ISSUE.**

KATHI CAULEY – DIRECTOR

BRENT RUEHLOW – DEPUTY DIRECTOR

MARJ THORMAN – CSP SUPERVISOR, KIM

PROPP- EMH SUPERVISOR, TIFFANY

CONGDON – CCS SUPERVISOR, KATIE

SCHICKOWSKI – ALT. CARE COORDINATOR,

LAURA WAGNER – INTAKE SUPERVISOR,

KEVIN REILLY – CPS SUPERVISOR & JESSIE

GODEK – JJ SUPERVISOR

The crisis stabilization committee met monthly,
brainstorming and implementing all kinds of
different ideas to serve our purpose:



TO FACILITATE BETTER TREATMENT FOR YOUTH

TO IDENTIFY YOUTH WHO ARE POSSIBLY AT RISK

TO ENHANCE OUR PRACTICES

TO CONVERSE ACROSS THE ENTIRE DEPARTMENT

TO DEVELOP MORE RESOURCES FOR YOUTH



Committee members continued to meet while reaching out to community partners, placement agencies, schools and providers to design innovative, new services that would develop more resources and provide better treatment for youth in Jefferson County.

Despite all this greatness, there remained a missing piece to the puzzle.....



**The missing piece – INTEGRATED
CRISIS PLANS**

INTEGRATED CRISIS PLANS



- The team reviewed the current crisis plans and made the decision to enrich them by asking questions that focused on the family unit, not just the individual in crisis.
- A training was provided to all Human Services staff members who work directly with kids and families on crisis planning with kids and families, and team updates were provided as the integrated crisis plans were rolled out.



Juvenile Justice Data

The Juvenile Justice Team met individually to discuss the outcomes they wanted to measure and what data to collect. Knowing how traumatic it can be for a youth to be removed from his or her home or to be placed in a secure detention facility, we hoped that the ICP's would lead to better outcomes in those areas.

- SELECTED DATA:
- **Change of Placement** (either from home or via move to another placement due to crisis/behaviors).
- **Reunification**
- **Secure Detention Stays**
- **Re-referrals**

Change of Placement



Pre-ICP implementation (1/1/16-5/31/16)

- Ten juveniles moved via court action during this period
- Four of those youth moved multiple times
- 15 total moves occurred
- Average of **3 moves per month** (group average; not per person)

Post-ICP implementation - 6/1/16-12/31/16

- 12 juveniles moved via court action during this period
- Three of those youth moved multiple times
- 17 total moves occurred
- Average of **2.4 moves per month** (group average; not per person)

Reunification



Pre-ICP implementation (1/1/16-5/31/16)

- Nine youth who had been in an out of home placement reunified with their families during the reporting period.
- 33% were long term placements; 67% were short term TPC's.

Post-ICP implementation - 6/1/16-12/31/16

- Four youth who had been in an out of home placement reunified with their families during the reporting period.
- 50% were long term placements; 50% were short term TPC's.

Secure Detention Stays



Pre-ICP implementation (1/1/16-5/31/16)

- 14 youth were placed in a secure detention facility via 72-hour hold or Temporary Physical Custody
- This is an average of **2.8 per month.**

Post-ICP implementation - 6/1/16-12/31/16

- 14 youth were placed in a secure detention facility via 72-hour hold or Temporary Physical Custody
- This is an average of **2.0 per month.**

Re-Referrals



Pre-ICP implementation (1/1/16-5/31/16)

- A total of 19 re-referrals (new ch. 938 referral of a youth already receiving services) were received during the reporting period.
- This is an average of **3.8 per month.**

Post-ICP implementation - 6/1/16-12/31/16

- A total of 18 re-referrals were received during the reporting period.
- This is an average **2.6 per month.**



Lessons Learned

Takeaways



- Though small, we had positive outcomes in most of the areas we measured.
- More emphasis may need to be placed on the ICP for hard to place youth to maintain their placements. Three youth who experienced multiple moves are youth who currently reside or at one time resided in an Residential Treatment Facility. Together, these three youth had 39% of the total changes of placement.
- An additional Niatx project may need to be considered in the area of reunification and how to reduce the total amount of time in out of home care.

What did we do after all that hard work?

